

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Final Office Action mailed August 4, 2010. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application and they stand rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103((a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,277,957 issued to Rowley et al. (hereinafter "*Rowley*") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,072,967 issued to Saulpaugh et al. (hereinafter "*Saulpaugh*"). Claims 10-11 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Rowley*, *Saulpaugh*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,290,048 issued to Barnett et al. (hereinafter "*Barnett*"). Claims 12-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over *Rowley* in view of *Saulpaugh* and *Barnett*.

Rather than argue the current rejections from the recent Final Office Action, applicant has elected to amend Independent Claim 1 (although not obligated to do so). Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites "*...the object store module comprises a content store to store the objects and a tag store to index the objects stored in the object store...wherein a particular search is scheduled for a recurring time interval and includes a particular search query with selected terms, and wherein certain results of the particular search trigger an alarm in a form of an e-mail message to be sent to an administrator.*"

First, no reference a record discusses a content store to store the objects, along with a tag store to index the objects stored in the object store. Second, no reference discloses ***a particular search being scheduled for a recurring time interval***. Third, no reference discusses how certain results of the particular search would trigger an alarm: much less an alarm in the form of an e-mail message to be sent to an administrator. These features are outlined by Independent Claim 1, yet none are discussed in the cited references.

For at least these reasons, Independent Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. In addition, the other Independent Claims recite similar (but not identical) limitations and, therefore, are allowable over the cited reference using analogous reasoning. Additionally, the corresponding dependent claims from these Independent Claims are also patentably distinct for related reasons. Thus, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable as they are patentable over the references of record. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

No additional fees are believed due. However, please apply any other charges or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4889 of PATENT CAPITAL GROUP, referencing the attorney docket number referenced above.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214-823-1241.

Respectfully submitted,

Patent Capital Group
Attorneys for Applicant

/Thomas J. Frame/

Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: October 5, 2010

Customer No. 97298